

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the non-final Office Action dated April 9, 2007. A Petition for Extension of Time (one month) and the fee therefor are submitted herewith.

Claims 1-14, 22-24 and 56-85 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Further, claims 15-21, 25-27 and 54 are withdrawn from consideration at this time. Therefore, claims 28-53 and 55 are the claims currently presented for examination.

Claims 28, 30-33, 39, 40, 46, 49 and 52 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

Rejection of Claims 28, 30, 44-53 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 28, 30, 44-53 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shiraishi, U.S. Patent No. 5,746,638. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 28 requires a separation preventing device structured to prevent a separation of the magnet from the magnet installation recess, the separation preventing device being a magnet installation member inserted into the magnet installation recess and comprising a circumferential portion, a surface of which is in contact with the magnet installation recess, and a lid portion positioned between the magnet and an outside of the part, the lid configured to close an upper opening of the magnet installation member, the magnet installation member having a shape of a cylinder of which a bottom side is open.

According to an aspect of applicant's invention as claimed in claim 28, a modular magnet installation member is thus provided for conveniently and quickly securing the magnet inside the part.

Shiraishi discloses toy blocks magnetically connectable to each other (Shiraishi, Abstract), in which a magnet holder 37 has a circular opening 40 with a diameter somewhat smaller than the corresponding permanent magnet 34, and surrounding each circular opening 40 is a circular flange 41 formed so that the disk-shaped permanent magnet 34 is supported on the flange 41. Formed up right from an outer peripheral edge portion of the circular flange 41 is a short cylindrical portion 42, the diameter of which is somewhat greater than the diameter of the disk-shaped permanent magnet 34, so that an inner peripheral wall of the short cylindrical portion

42 serves as a guide for the rotation of the disk-shaped permanent magnet 34 (Shiraishi, Figs. 6 and 7; column 5, lines 14-33). Shiraishi further discloses that the diameter of the inner periphery of the circular flange 41 is smaller than the diameter of the disk-shaped plate 35 so that the disk-shaped plate 35 and the disk-shaped permanent magnet 34 are prevented from falling out through the opening 40 (Shiraishi, column 5, lines 65 – column 6, line 3).

Shiraishi does not disclose or suggest a magnet installation member having a shape of a cylinder of which a bottom side is open, as required by claim 28. Further, Shiraishi does not disclose or suggest such a cylinder-shaped magnet installation member comprising a lid portion positioned between a magnet and an outside of the part to close an upper opening of the magnet installation member, as further required by claim 28. Accordingly, Shiraishi does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 28.

Further, claim 30 requires a magnet installation member fixing structure extended downward of the circumferential portion or formed outward on an outer surface of the circumferential portion. The Office Action recognizes that Shiraishi does not disclose or suggest such a magnet installation member fixing means (Office Action, page 4). Accordingly, Shiraishi does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 30.

Claims 44-53 and 55 depend from claim 30 and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Rejection of Claims 28-30, 44-53 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 28-30, 44-53 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Hunts, U.S. Patent No. 6,749,480. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 28 requires a separation preventing device structured to prevent a separation of the magnet from the magnet installation recess, the separation preventing device being a magnet installation member inserted into the magnet installation recess and comprising a circumferential portion, a surface of which is in contact with the magnet installation recess, and a lid portion positioned between the magnet and an outside of the part, the lid configured to close an upper opening of the magnet installation member, and the magnet installation member has a shape of a cylinder of which a bottom side is open.

Hunts discloses a device for connecting several multi-shaped non-metallic bodies utilizing disc-shaped permanent magnets (Hunts, Abstract), which includes a disc magnet 3 positioned inside a bearing 4 and closed on top by a separate larger retaining cap 2 (Hunts, Fig. 2; column 2, lines 25-38). As shown, for example in Hunts, Figs. 2 and 3, the bearing 4 is provided to allow the disc magnet 3 to rotate as necessary.

Accordingly, Hunts does not disclose or suggest a separation preventing device that is a magnet installation member comprising a lid portion. First, the bearing 4 of Hunts does not include a lid portion positioned between the magnet and an outside of the part. Further, the bearing 4 of Hunts does not include such a lid portion, which also closes an upper opening of the magnet installation member and thus acts as a separation preventing device for the magnet. Accordingly, Hunts does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 28.

Claim 30 requires a magnet installation member fixing structure extended downward of the circumferential portion or formed outward on an outer surface of the circumferential portion. The Office Action recognizes that Hunts does not disclose or suggest such a fixing means (Office Action, page 5). Accordingly, Hunts does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 30.

Claim 29 depends from claim 28. Claims 44-53 and 55 depend from claim 30. Therefore, claims 29, 44-53 and 55 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Rejection of Claims 31-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 31-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Shiraishi in view of Kim, WO 03/063993. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner acknowledges that Shiraishi fails to disclose or suggest fixing means as required by claims 31-43, but alleges that Kim discloses such a feature.

The present application is a Section 371 of PCT KR 04/00048 filed on January 14, 2004 with foreign priority from Republic of Korea Applications 10/2003 0002395 filed on January 14, 2003 and 10/2003 0016688 filed on March 18, 2003. Kim has an international filing date of January 28, 2003 and is therefore antedated by the earlier Korean priority date of the present

application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kim should be removed as a reference against the present application. Therefore, this rejection is improper.

Rejection of Claims 31-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 31-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Hunts in view of Kim, WO 03/063993. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.


The Office Action acknowledges that Hunts fails to disclose or suggest fixing means as required by claim 30, from which claims 31-43 depend. As discussed, Kim should be removed as a reference against the present application. Therefore, this rejection is improper.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON August 9, 2007

MM:GB:ns

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700